

meritorious legislation, the other body did not deal with it promptly.

Now, I hope the time has come when we will be able to bring another 245(i) bill to the floor. But I do not think it accurately represents what 336 of us did on May 21, to say that we have turned our backs on those families. There were only 43 no votes on May 21. And I think the vast majority, the 336 of us who voted yes, will have our day in court some time in the future and a 245(i) extension that is fair to all will be sent to the President of the United States. I urge an aye vote on H.R. 3525.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3525, the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act, because this bill strengthens the security of our borders, secures our visa entry system, and enhances our ability to deter potential terrorists. However, I also rise to express my displeasure that an extension of Section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was dropped from the final version of this bill.

My support of H.R. 3525 is based on the fact that it improves the resources, training, and technology available to our border personnel to increase the effectiveness of our efforts to improve border security. This bill requires the Attorney General to begin installing biometric data readers and scanners at U.S. ports of entry so we can more accurately deter individuals with false passports or visas.

H.R. 3525 also improves coordination and information-sharing by the State Department, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), and law enforcement and intelligence agencies. For example, consular officers who issue visas will now be required to transmit electronic versions of visa files to the INS, so that this critical information is available to immigration inspectors at U.S. ports of entry. By enhancing our ability to screen visitors to the U.S. before their arrival, we will help to keep terrorist cells from entering our country.

This bill also improves the monitoring of foreign students and exchange visitors. H.R. 3525 expands the current foreign student monitoring program in our colleges and universities to include flight schools, language training programs, and vocational schools. It also enhances the reporting requirements placed on the INS, the State Department and educational institutions. In addition, it requires the INS, in consultation with the Department of Education, to periodically review institutions enrolling foreign students and receiving exchange visitors, to ensure that they adhere to the mandated reporting and record-keeping requirements.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the many merits of this bill, I am however very disappointed that it does not include an extension of Section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 245(i) allows eligible immigrants to stay in this country by paying a substantial fee of \$1,000 to adjust their status to permanent residency based on a close family member or employer sponsor. Under Section 245(i), the only eligible immigrants are those who have been physically present in the United States since before December 1998 and have an established familiar relationship or employment based petition filed with the INS. Immigrants who qualify would be screened for criminal offenses, fraud, and would need to meet all other conditions of admissibility—just like any other immigrant who applies for a green card. An extension of 245(i) does not provide a

loophole to our border security—anyone found to be linked to any criminal activity would continue to face deportation or detention.

A permanent extension of Section 245(i) is an issue of great importance to the Hispanic Caucus and the entire Latino community. President Bush publicly supported an extension, as have the AFL-CIO and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In fact, the House was scheduled to vote on an extension of this important provision, but due to the unconscionable attacks of September 11th this legislation was pulled from consideration and never rescheduled.

Since then, I along with other members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus have been urging the leadership of the House to bring up and pass an extension to Section 245(i) before the end of the year. We felt confident that adding an extension of Section 245(i) to H.R. 3525 would create the right balance between the need to keep our borders safe from terrorist threats, and keep the avenues for legal permanent residency open to hard working immigrants.

Without an extension of Section 245(i), we are not helping to secure our borders; we are instead promoting the separation of families and the increase of individuals on our unemployment roles. It is therefore unfortunate that Section 245(i) has fallen victim to those who equate immigration with terrorism.

There is no doubt that our country needs long-term solutions to security problems at our borders, and H.R. 3525 is a positive step in that direction. In our effort to secure our nation however, we must not close the door to our ability to legalize employees of American companies or spouses and children of U.S. citizens. An extension of Section 245(i) is pro-family, pro-business, and good for America. I hope the Bush Administration will keep its promise and work with the bipartisan congressional supporters of Section 245(i) to gain passage of an extension before the end of the 107th Congress.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3525, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3525, ENHANCED BORDER SECURITY ACT AND VISA ENTRY REFORM ACT OF 2001

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3525, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN PERSONS FOR BURIAL IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3423) to amend title 38, United States Code, to enact into law eligibility of certain veterans and their dependents for burial in Arlington National Cemetery, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3423

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN PERSONS FOR BURIAL IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### “§2412. Arlington National Cemetery: eligibility of certain persons for burial

“(a)(1) The remains of a member or former member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces who at the time of death was under 60 years of age and who, but for age, would have been eligible at the time of death for retired pay under chapter 1223 of title 10 may be buried in Arlington National Cemetery on the same basis as the remains of members of the Armed Forces entitled to retired pay under that chapter.

“(2) The remains of the dependents of a member whose remains are permitted under paragraph (1) to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery may be buried in that cemetery on the same basis as dependents of members of the Armed Forces entitled to retired pay under such chapter 1223.

“(b)(1) The remains of a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces who dies in the line of duty while on active duty for training or inactive duty training may be buried in Arlington National Cemetery on the same basis as the remains of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty.

“(2) The remains of the dependents of a member whose remains are permitted under paragraph (1) to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery may be buried in that cemetery on the same basis as dependents of members on active duty.”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

##### “2412. Arlington National Cemetery: eligibility of certain persons for burial.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2412 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to interments occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 2. PLACEMENT OF MEMORIAL IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY HONORING THE VICTIMS OF THE ACTS OF TERRORISM PERPETRATED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001.

(a) AUTHORIZATION TO PLACE MEMORIAL.—The Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct and place in Arlington National Cemetery a memorial marker honoring the victims of the acts of terrorism perpetrated against the United States on September 11, 2001.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH FAMILIES OF VICTIMS BEFORE USE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Army shall consult with the